



BULLETIN EXPRESS

20TH, 21ST AND 22ND NEGOTIATING SESSION

NEW REPRESENTATIVE ON MANAGEMENT'S NEGOTIATING TEAM

Due to the fact we were preparing for the meeting with local administrations on April 30 to start negotiations on the items in Annex «A» (see report of that «meeting» in Express no: 17), we had only one negotiating session with management in the week of the 28th of April.

During the first week in May a new member joined management's negotiating team, Mr. Gaston Côté of the Ministry of Higher Education and Science who was previously at the CEGEP support personnel negotiating table.

SENIORITY

DEPARTEMENTAL COORDINATION

Management insists on introducing a clause which permits accumulation of seniority for departmental coordination. As their policy according to them is to draw from the most advantageous clauses between the two decrees (FNEEQ/FEEC) they said, they have taken this clause from FEEC and that it caused no problems whatsoever.

We believe that never has a clause been included in a collective agreement without reason. This is exactly what arbitrators always say as well. As in the past collective agreements, departmental coordination has always been part of a teacher's workload. Therefore we see absolutely no reason to specify that a teacher accumulates seniority while working. It is only natural ... unless management has ulterior motives by insisting at the inclusion of such a clause ...!

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Concerning accumulation of seniority in continuing education, management admits that the text in their offers is no less ambiguous than the decree but they are assuring us that their intentions are to recognize accumulation of seniority in Cont. Ed. for relocation purposes.

For teachers in the 200 «charges» in Cont. Ed., the «partie patronale» explained that even though there is no specific order of priority for a «poste» for these teachers they (management) will continue to give them same priority (priority 9) as the one recognized to non-permanent full-time teachers in the regular teaching.

JOB SECURITY

MODIFICATION OF PROGRAMMES OR STRUCTURES

Management's offers foresee local consultation on the above matters as opposed to obligation by the College to bring such matters on the CRT as it was the case in the decree, clause 5-4.02. Management assured us that their intention was not at all to change something already in force. Why then has the text been changed we asked ...? They'll see if they have to correct their text.

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHING LOAD

We have once again witnessed management's wide open and abusive interpretation of Bill 37. While Annex «A» in this law stipulates that it is the workload distribution (by department and by course) which is subject to local negotiations, management interprets it to mean allocation of teaching (distribution of teachers by discipline) and they are blaming us of having taken a «minimalist» approach concerning

the interpretation of Annex «A», pointing out that we should not be attaching a sacrosanct value to each and every technical term. We do not take chances ... and we prefer to stick to their literal value, to be on the safe side.

DISPLACEMENT PREMIUM

Management wants to eliminate the displacement premium. They see it as an incentive for teachers on availability to change zones. They say the premium defeats the purpose, for they claim a salary protection of only 50% will prove a strong enough incentive for MEDs to start accepting jobs outside their zone!

PLACEMENT OFFICE, «BUREAU» (DE PLACEMENT)

Management pointed out that they are working on revising the mechanisms of the «bureau» in their offers. They have also admitted that their text, in its present form, obliges MEDs to stand always on their toes and be constantly on stand-by, something which deprives them of their right to summer vacations.

We told management that we want to see the functioning of the «Bureau» improved, and to make sure that teachers obtain the means to verify if their rights have been respected as well as have access to recourse if they feel they have not. According to us this implies the necessity to reintroduce the sending of the MED list with seniority attached as well all operational reports of the «Bureau» to all those on availability. Management expressed interest in what we are proposing and they'll submit new offers on this question within few days.

For non-permanents, we remind, we are asking for the introduction of a recall list on the local level.

UTILIZATION OF MEDs

To management, our demands aiming at keeping MEDs within the College and reducing as much as possible their moving around (from college to college), as well as the right to refuse «charges» in another College, is an approach that can not be defended. «We have the best system of job security for life» they said, adding that our position threatens even the very existence of such job security policy.

MANAGEMENT STEPS BACK IN ONE OF THEIR INITIAL DEMANDS

On May 13, and during our 22nd meeting, management informed us that they are about to submit a new text concerning calculation of the CI (individual workload). The CI, they said, is not going to be calculated on weekly basis as they had it originally in their «dépôt» but by semester, as it was in the decree. However they are still maintaining that the preparation for the same course in the second semester is not going to be counted toward calculation of the CI of the teacher.

INVOLVEMENT IN TEACHING RELATED TASKS

Finally, they specified that they are sending further at the local level items which touch strictly upon job security in spite of the fact that they may be issues of provincial negotiations. For us discussions at the CRT concerning involvement of MEDs in teaching related tasks are directly linked with job security which is a sectorial issue. Management however stressed the point that their intentions are not to give teachers jobs of the support personnel even if their text leaves such a possibility open.

